

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claim claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0059617 to Terakado et al. ("*Terakado*").

Applicant has amended claims 7, 9, and 10. Claims 7-10 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Terakado*. In order to properly establish that *Terakado* anticipates Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 7 recites an apparatus including, for example:

...  
a request means for requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network;

....  
a registering means for registering the received address information;

...  
the control means controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the registered address information.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

*Terakado* discloses a remote control 120 that includes a display screen 122 that can display home appliances 130 (e.g. a VCR, AV-HDD, PC, and audio equipment) (paragraphs 0042-0043 and Fig. 3). According to the Office Action, remote control 120 appears to correspond to the claimed "control apparatus," and home appliances 130 appear to correspond to the claimed "first information processing apparatus" and "second information processing apparatus" (Final Office Action at pages 2-3). This is not correct.

According to *Terakado*, display screen 122 of remote control 120 allows "view[ing] a single screen which combines operation panels 123 for the electronic apparatus or the home appliances 130" (paragraph 0043). In *Terakado*, when operating a desired home appliance, "the corresponding index section 123a is touched, and the corresponding operation panel 123 for the desired home appliance is displayed in the foreground" (paragraph 0044 and Fig. 3).

Based on this disclosure, display screen 122 of *Terakado* may display numerous home appliances, and the selection of the appropriate index section 123a enables the user to control the corresponding appliance. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Terakado* of requesting address information of one home appliance from a second home appliance. In contrast, *Terakado* merely discloses the ability to control numerous appliances independent of the other appliances. Therefore, *Terakado* does not teach or suggest "requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network," as recited in claim 7. Accordingly,

*Terakado* also does not teach or suggest a “registering means for registering the received address information,” as further recited in claim 7.

In addition, the control in *Terakado* occurs based on user selection of the appropriate appliance displayed on remote control 120. For example, if the user selects the VCR, as depicted in Fig. 3 of *Terakado*, the user may select operation buttons 123b, such as play or erase, to control the VCR. However, *Terakado* does not control a second appliance via the VCR based on “address information” of the second appliance. In contrast, *Terakado* merely controls a single appliance at a time. Therefore, *Terakado* also does not teach or suggest a “control means” that “controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the registered address information,” as further recited in claim 7.

*Terakado* fails to anticipate claim 7, and claim 7 is allowable. Claim 8 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 7. Independent claims 9 and 10 are allowable over *Terakado* for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 7.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 30, 2009

By:   
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220

**Philip J. Hoffmann**  
**Registration No. 46,340**